

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
ATELIER EUMORI,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
-against-	:	
	:	24-CV-3531 (VEC)
ROADGET BUSINESS PTE. LTD., a Singapore	:	
private limited company; SHEIN DISTRIBUTION	:	<u>ORDER</u>
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; SHEIN	:	
US SERVICES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability	:	
company; SHEIN TECHNOLOGY LLC, a	:	
Delaware limited liability company; and FASHION	:	
CHOICE PTE. LTD., a Singapore private limited	:	
company,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		

VALERIE CAPRONI, United States District Judge:

WHEREAS on December 2, 2024, the parties appeared before the Court via teleconference to discuss multiple discovery disputes;

WHEREAS during the teleconference, Plaintiff argued that Defendants should be required to produce documents reflecting “the relationship between and among the [D]efendants” because “in order to actually obtain proper injunctive relief, [P]laintiff needs to understand the chain of command and the relationship between these [D]efendants.” Transcript of December 2, 2024, Teleconference, Dkt. 40, at 17:1–16;

WHEREAS Defendants argued that it was unnecessary to produce these documents because they have already produced an organizational chart and the relevant terms and conditions from its website, and because they have not disputed joint and several liability or raised “any defenses regarding the allocation of liabilities and profits.” *Id.* at 17:21–18:6;


WHEREAS in *Keller v. Roadget Business Pte. Ltd. et al.*, No. 23-cv-10717, a case involving the same Defendants and the same attorneys, Magistrate Judge Netburn adjudicated a similar dispute and ordered Defendants to produce the requested materials, finding them relevant because “if the plaintiff gets a judgment against one, there may need to be an application to seek recovery against another.” Transcript of July 16, 2024, Conference, *Keller v. Roadget Business Pte. Ltd. et al.*, No. 23-cv-10717, Dkt. 65, at 21:2–12; and

WHEREAS in *Fitzpatrick v. Roadget Business Pte. Ltd. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-10592, another case involving the same Defendants and the same attorneys, Judge Furman denied a similar request from the plaintiff on the grounds that Defendants explicitly represented that they “do not dispute joint and several liability and that they are not asserting any defenses regarding the allocation of liabilities and profits.” October 22, 2024, Memo Endorsement on Defendants’ October 16, 2024, Letter, *Fitzpatrick v. Roadget Business Pte. Ltd. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-10592, Dkt. 58, at 4.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, because Defendants do not dispute joint and several liability, they are not required to produce documents reflecting the relationship between and among Defendants beyond that which they have already produced.

SO ORDERED.

Date: December 9, 2024
New York, New York



VALERIE CAPRONI
United States District Judge